

ceiling in this country. It is one of the primary reasons why there are earning differentials. The last thing we need to do is change the marriage penalty to make it more progressive, to put a penalty on those who are actually advancing. One does not want to be in an employer situation where they have an outstanding employee and they say, well, would you like to work additional hours, we would like to promote you and that person says, but the marriage penalty is capped. If I go up in a promotion here in this firm, my husband and my income will go over a certain point and all of a sudden we will be taxed differently.

If we start capping the marriage penalty as some are proposing to do, while it might sound good the fact is that the bias is being reinforced not only against marriage in this society, but it is also discriminating in the most degree against working women who are advancing to higher income salaries.

I thought one of our primary goals was to open up opportunities for women in this country to move up in the corporate ladder, to earn higher incomes. In most cases, not all cases but in most cases, the marriage penalty is a disincentive to women often who have not had the opportunities, who have gone back to school, who have been homemakers, they come back in and all of a sudden get whacked with this additional tax. So the irony is the double standard in the same speech of capping the marriage penalty and also talking about how to open up opportunities for women and all Americans to increase their salary.

You cannot talk out of one side of your mouth one way and out of the other side of your mouth the other. So I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) not only for his leadership in the marriage penalty but for having an elimination of the marriage penalty that is actually responsive to the type of concerns that Americans are having and that would really promote sexual equity in this country and marriage equity in this country rather than the other types of forms of this bill that lead to other unintended consequences.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) for his comments.

I would say to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that his point is really telling. The President wants to

get political bonus points by saying let us get rid of the glass ceiling and political bonus points by saying let us have something on the marriage penalty, but when we look at it, the way he does it, by putting that cap on there he undoes everything we would want to do to help women who want to pursue their careers.

I appreciate the gentleman making that point to our colleagues and to the people listening.

Let me close today by saying it was 3 years ago, almost to the day, when Sharon Mallory took out pen to paper and sent me this letter that launched my effort in eliminating the marriage penalty tax. I have teamed up with a great colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), and another great colleague, the gentlewoman Missouri (Ms. DANNER). This has become a bipartisan effort, because everyone realizes it is the right thing to do. There was a chart that was out here earlier, I wish I still had it, that showed how that \$1.8 trillion surplus could break up over the next 10 years. Half of it went to spending. There are plenty of lobbyists here in Washington who come and tell us how we can spend more money.

Another portion went for tax breaks to business and others, and farmers and others. There are plenty of lobbyists here to tell us how we can give tax breaks for businesses and other interests, but there was no place on that pie chart for families, because there are no lobbyists in Washington for families.

Families are spending their money paying their bills, helping their children to save for college, trying to make ends meet, planning for the future, trying to provide a vacation for their family. We need to do what is right even when there are no lobbyists, so that people like Sharon Mallory and Darryl Pierce do not have to write their congressman and say: Darryl and I would very much like to be married, and I must say it broke our hearts when we found out we cannot afford it because of the marriage penalty tax.

It will be a great day in this institution when we get rid of the marriage penalty tax once and for all.

I urge my colleagues to join us in the coming week as the leadership brings forth this bill so we can send a message and pass into law something that would be good for families throughout this land, the marriage penalty elimination bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for February 3 through February 15 on account of official business.

Mr. VENTO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. SLAUGHTER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. LOBIONDO) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, February 8.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MINGE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1733. An act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to provide for a national standard of interoperability and portability applicable to electronic food stamp benefit transactions.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel during the third and fourth quarters of 1999 by Committees of the House of Representatives, as well as a consolidated report of foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-authorized official travel during fourth quarter of 1999, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, and for miscellaneous groups in connection with official foreign travel during the calendar year 1999 are as follows: